ORIGINAL



BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION

_	II VEOLIAED	
2		
3	KRISTIN K. MAYES - CHAIRMAN 2010 MAY -5 GARY PIERCE	P 3: 46
4	PAUL NEWMAN SANDRA D. KENNEDY BOB STUMP AZ CORP COR DOCKET CO	Wission
5	BOB STUMP	MTROL
6	LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS, LLC) DOCKET NO. T-03654A-05-0415
7) DOCKET NO. T-01051B-05-0415
	Complainant,)
8	vs.	NOTICE OF FINAL ORDER AND REMAND
9) AND
10	QWEST CORPORATION,) AND
10		MOTION FOR PROCEDURAL
11	Respondent	CONFERENCE
12))

Level 3 Communications, LLC ("Level 3") provides notice that the Ninth Circuit has issued an order in the matter of Level 3's appeal of the March 6, 2008 Order of the United States District Court, which had remanded the appeal of Decision No. 68855 (July 28, 2006) to the Arizona Corporation Commission for further proceedings. The Ninth Circuit demurred from addressing the substantive grounds of Level 3's appeal and dismissed the case on procedural grounds. The Court found that District Court's order was not a final, appealable order. A copy of the Ninth Circuit order and related mandate is attached as Exhibit 1.

As a result of the Ninth Circuit order, the procedural status of this docket is similar to that of the complaint involving PacWest Communications and Qwest (Docket No. T-01051B-05-0495 et al.), which is on remand from the Arizona District Court and stayed pending the outcome of Level 3's appeal the Ninth Circuit. See November 3, 2009 Procedural Order in Docket No. T-01051B-05-0495 et al.

Anizona Corporation Commission

MAY - 5 2010



Level 3 requests a procedural conference to address how to proceed.¹ Because the FCC and the U.S. Court of Appeals in Core Communications, Inc. (Docket 08-1365) have substantiated Level 3's position that ISP bound traffic can only be subject to local reciprocal compensation and not access charges as Qwest has argued, Level 3 requests, at a minimum, the opportunity to brief the issues on remand from the District Court's order.

Level 3 also proposes that the procedural conference be a joint procedural conference with the Pac West docket (Docket No. T-01051B-05-0495 et al.). Level 3 is providing a copy of this Notice and Motion to counsel for Pac West and Qwest.

WHEREFORE Level 3 requests that a joint procedural conference be scheduled for this docket and Docket No. T-01051B-05-0495 et al.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 5 day of May 2010.

ROSHKA DEWULF & PATTEN, PLC

By

Michael W. Patten

One Arizona Center

400 East Van Buren Street, Suite 800

Phoenix, Arizona 85004

Attorneys for Level 3 Communications, LLC

¹ Level 3 will attend the prehearing conference in person.

1	Original and 15 copies of the foregoing	
2	filed this day of May 2010 with:	
3	Docket Control Arizona Corporation Commission	
4	1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007	
5	Copy of the foregoing hand-delivered/mailed	
6	this 3 th day of May 2010 to:	
7	Jane Rodda, Esq Administrative Law Judge	
8	Hearing Division Arizona Corporation Commission	
9	400 West Congress Tucson, Arizona 85701	
10	Maureen A. Scott, Esq	
11	Legal Division Arizona Corporation Commission	
12	1200 West Washington Phoenix, Arizona 85007	
13	Steve Olea	
14	Utilities Division Arizona Corporation Commission	
15	1200 West Washington Phoenix, Arizona 85007	
16	Norman G. Curtright	
17	Corporate Counsel Qwest Corporation	
18	20 East Thomas Rd, 16 th Floor Phoenix, Arizona 85012	
19	Joan S. Burke	
20	Law Office of Joan S. Burke 1650 North First Avenue	
21	Phoenix, AZ 85003	
22	•	
23	By May Veestets	
24	- July of the are	
25		
26		

EXHIBIT

"1"

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

APR 19 2010

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

QWEST CORPORATION,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

ν.

LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS LLC,

Defendant - Appellant,

MIKE GLEASON; et al.,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

PAC-WEST TELECOMM, INC.,

Defendant,

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION,

Defendant.

No. 08-15887

D.C. No. 2:06-CV-02130-SRB U.S. District Court for Arizona, Phoenix

MANDATE

The judgment of this Court, entered March 26, 2010, takes effect this date.

This constitutes the formal mandate of this Court issued pursuant to Rule 41(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.

FOR THE COURT:

Molly C. Dwyer Clerk of Court

Lee-Ann Collins Deputy Clerk



NOT FOR PUBLICATION

MAR 26 2010

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

QWEST CORPORATION,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION,

Defendant,

MIKE GLEASON et al.,

Defendants - Appellees,

LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS, LLC,

Defendant - Appellant,

and

PAC-WEST TELECOMM, INC.,

Defendant,

No. 08-15887

D.C. No. 2:06-CV-02130-SRB

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Arizona Susan R. Bolton, District Judge, Presiding

^{*} This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

Argued November 4, 2009; Resubmitted February 19, 2010 San Francisco, California

Before: B. FLETCHER, CANBY, and GRABER, Circuit Judges.

Level 3 Communications, LLC ("Level 3"), and Qwest Corporation

("Qwest") entered into an Interconnection Agreement to provide for the exchange
of Internet Service Provider ("ISP")-bound traffic pursuant to the

Telecommunications Act of 1996 ("the Act"). The parties agreed to exchange
"ISP-bound traffic (as that term is used in the FCC [Federal Communications

Commission] ISP [Remand] Order) at the FCC ordered rate, pursuant to the FCC
ISP [Remand] Order." Level 3 filed a complaint with the Arizona Corporation

Commission ("Commission"), claiming that this provision required Qwest to pay
intercarrier compensation to Level 3 for virtual NXX calls (calls to a customer
whose area code bears no relation to its physical location). The Commission ruled
in favor of Level 3, and Qwest appealed to the district court. Level 3 now appeals
an order from the district court that remanded the case to the Commission.

We dismiss the appeal as being from a non-final order. A remand order is considered final where (1) the district court conclusively resolves a separable legal issue, (2) the remand order forces the agency to apply a potentially erroneous rule which may result in a wasted proceeding, and (3) review would, as a practical matter, be foreclosed if an immediate appeal were unavailable.

Chugach Alaska Corp. v. Lujan, 915 F.2d 454, 457 (9th Cir. 1990). Here, the remand order fails the third prong because denying an appeal now would not foreclose review in the future. The district court in this case did not resolve Qwest's claims for relief, and it did not enter a final judgment. In fact, the district court did not enter judgment on any of the issues presented by Qwest.

Our precedent instructs that a remand order may be considered a final, appealable order only when "review would, as a practical matter, be foreclosed if an immediate appeal were unavailable." Alsea Valley Alliance v. Dep't of

Commerce, 358 F.3d 1181, 1184 (9th Cir. 2004) (internal quotation marks omitted). Neither party is foreclosed from seeking appellate review, in the future, of any legal determination made in the district court's final order. Because the remand order is not a final, appealable order, we must dismiss the appeal. See

Williamson v. UNUM Life Ins. Co. of Am., 160 F.3d 1247 (9th Cir. 1998)

(holding that a remand order was not a final order); Alsea Valley Alliance, 358

F.3d at 1184 (same).

DISMISSED.



ca9_ecfnoticing@ca9.uscourt s.gov

04/19/2010 12:12 PM

То

cc bcc

Subject 08-15887 Qwest Corporation v. LEVEL 3
COMMUNICATIONS LLC, et al "Mandate Issued"

NOTE TO PUBLIC ACCESS USERS Judicial Conference of the United States policy permits attorneys of record and parties in a case (including pro se litigants) to receive one free electronic copy of all documents filed electronically, if receipt is required by law or directed by the filer. PACER access fees apply to all other users. To avoid later charges, download a copy of each document during this first viewing.

United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

Notice of Docket Activity

The following transaction was entered on 04/19/2010 at 12:10:11 PM PDT and filed on 04/19/2010

Case Name:

Qwest Corporation v. LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS LLC, et al

Case Number:

<u>08-15887</u>

Document(s):

Document(s)

Docket Text:

MANDATE ISSUED.(BBF, WCC and SPG) [7306429] (LC)

The following document(s) are associated with this transaction:

Document Description: Mandate Order

Original Filename:

/opt/ACECF/live/forms/leeann_0815887_7306429_v2Order-Mandate_216.pdf

Electronic Document Stamp:

[STAMP acecfStamp_ID=1106763461 [Date=04/19/2010] [FileNumber=7306429-0] [8b9bb8b35a0a65639c9c1220e1e763da2cf77819872a45ee0891ce4930481333b72bb1 379b80a5c84ebd984bbfb728fd4a534ed0a9233794390137aa899f4ce1]]

Recipients:

- Ms. Alward, Janice, Chief Counsel
- Ms. Burke, Joan S., Attorney
- Curtright, Norman G
- Derstine, John Matthew, Attorney
- Dethlefs, Thomas M., Attorney
- Mr. Devaney, John Michael, Counsel
- Mr. Patten, Michael, Attorney
- Savage, Christopher W.
- Ms. Scott, Maureen A., Senior Attorney

- USDC, Phoenix
- Wright, Christopher J.

Notice will be electronically mailed to:

Ms. Alward, Janice, Chief Counsel
Ms. Burke, Joan S., Attorney
Derstine, John Matthew, Attorney
Mr. Devaney, John Michael, Counsel
Mr. Patten, Michael, Attorney
Ms. Scott, Maureen A., Senior Attorney
USDC, Phoenix
Wright, Christopher J.

Case participants listed below will not receive this electronic notice:

Curtright, Norman G QWEST CORPORATION 16th Floor 20 E Thomas Rd. Phoenix, AZ 85012

Dethlefs, Thomas M., Attorney US WEST INC.
Law Department
Suite 5100
1801 California St.
Denver, CO 80202

Savage, Christopher W.
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
Suite 200
1919 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20006

The following information is for the use of court personnel:

DOCKET ENTRY ID: 7306429 **RELIEF(S) DOCKETED:**

DOCKET PART(S) ADDED: 6937811